

Persistence and global attractivity in the model $A_{n+1} = A_n F(A_{n-m})$

Dang Vu Giang

Hanoi Institute of Mathematics

18 Hoang Quoc Viet, 10307 Hanoi, Vietnam

e-mail: <dangvugiang@yahoo.com>

March 29, 2010

Abstract. First, we systemize earlier results the uniform persistence for discrete model $A_{n+1} = A_n F(A_{n-m})$ of population growth, where $F : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing. Second, we investigation the effect of delay m when F is not monotone. We are mainly using ω -limit set of persistent solution, which is discussed in more general by P. Walters, 1982.

2000 AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION: 39A12.

KEY WORDS: *Equilibrium, ω -limit set, full limiting sequences, 3/2-stability*

1. Introduction

Recently, several authors (Graef et al 1998, 2006, Liz 2007, Tkachenko et al 2006) study the model

$$A_{n+1} = A_n F(A_{n-m}), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (1.1)$$

where $F : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing. They assume that there is a unique positive equilibrium $\bar{x}$ of (1.1). Clearly, $F(\bar{x}) = 1$. We say that $\bar{x}$ is globally attractive if all solution of (1.1) convergence to $\bar{x}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Graef et al (1998) investigate the bobwhite quail population with

$$F(x) = \alpha + \frac{\beta}{1 + x^r}.$$

They prove that if

$$r < \frac{2\alpha + \beta + 2\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \alpha\beta}}{\beta} \frac{3m + 4}{2(m + 1)^2},$$

then

$$\bar{x} = \sqrt[r]{\frac{\alpha + \beta - 1}{1 - \alpha}}$$

is global attractive. Liz (2007) improves this result. More exactly, the equilibrium $\bar{x}$ is globally attractive if

$$r < \frac{\beta}{(\alpha + \beta - 1)(1 - \alpha)} \frac{3m + 4}{2(m + 1)^2}.$$

If $m = 0$ this result is sharp.

2. The Persistence

In this section we assume $F : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is continuous only. A positive solution $\{A_n\}_{n=-m}^{\infty}$ is called persistent if

$$0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n < \infty.$$

The following theorem gives a sufficient condition for persistent (non-extinctive) populations.

Theorem 1. *Assume that*

$$0 < F(x) \leq c < \infty \quad (2.1)$$

for all $x \geq 0$ and

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} F(x) < 1, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0+0} F(x) > 1. \quad (2.3)$$

Then every solution $\{A_n\}_{n=-m}^{\infty}$ of (1.1) is persistent.

Proof. First, we prove that $\{A_n\}_{n=-m}^{\infty}$ is bounded from above. Assume, for the sake of a contradiction, that $\limsup A_n = \infty$. For each integer $n \geq m$, we define

$$k_n := \max\{\rho : -m \leq \rho \leq n, A_\rho = \max_{-m \leq i \leq n} A_i\}.$$

Observe that $k_{-m} \leq k_{-m+1} \leq \dots \leq k_n \rightarrow \infty$ and that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{k_n} = \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

Let $n_0 > 0$ such that $k_{n_0} > 0$. We have for $n > n_0$,

$$A_{k_n-1} F(A_{k_n-1-m}) = A_{k_n} \geq A_{k_n-1}$$

and therefore,

$$F(A_{k_n-1-m}) \geq 1.$$

By (2.2), this implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{k_n-1-m} < \infty. \quad (2.5)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k_n} &= A_{k_n-1} F(A_{k_n-1-m}) = \dots \\ &= A_{k_n-1-m} F(A_{k_n-1-2m}) \dots F(A_{k_n-1-m}) \\ &\leq A_{k_n-1-m} c^{m+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now take $\limsup$ on both sides we have $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{k_n} < \infty$ which contradicts (2.4). Thus, $\{A_n\}_{n=-m}^\infty$ is bounded from above. Let K be an upper bound of $\{A_n\}_{n=-m}^\infty$.

Next, we prove that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n > 0$. Assume, for the sake of a contradiction, that $\liminf A_n = 0$. For each integer $n \geq m$, we define

$$s_n := \max\{\rho : -m \leq \rho \leq n, A_\rho = \min_{-m \leq i \leq n} A_i\}.$$

Clearly, $s_{-m} \leq s_{-m+1} \leq \dots \leq s_n \rightarrow \infty$ and that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{s_n} = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

Let $n_0 > 0$ such that $s_{n_0} > 0$. We have for $n > n_0$,

$$A_{s_n} = A_{s_{n-1}} F(A_{s_{n-1}-m}) \geq A_{s_n} F(A_{s_{n-1}-m})$$

and therefore,

$$F(A_{s_{n-1}-m}) \leq 1.$$

By (2.3), this implies that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{s_{n-1}-m} > 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{s_n} &= A_{s_{n-1}} F(A_{s_{n-1}-m}) = \dots \\ &= A_{s_{n-1}-m} F(A_{s_{n-1}-2m}) \dots F(A_{s_{n-1}-m}) \\ &\geq A_{s_{n-1}-m} \left[\min_{x \in [0, K]} F(x) \right]^{m+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now take $\liminf$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides we have $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{s_n} > 0$ which contradicts (2.6). The proof is complete.

Next, we will use full-limiting sequences to estimate the $\liminf$ and $\limsup A_n$. Let $\{A_n\}_{n=-m}^\infty$ be a persistent solution of (1.1). Then there are two sequences $\{P_n\}_{n=-\infty}^\infty$ and $\{Q_n\}_{n=-\infty}^\infty$ called full limiting sequences satisfying equation (1.1) for all $n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = P_0, \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = Q_0,$$

and

$$Q_0 \leq P_n \leq P_0, \quad Q_0 \leq Q_n \leq P_0, \quad \text{for all } n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots.$$

The existence of these sequences is guaranteed by Giang et al (2005) and Walter (1982). It is very convenient to put

$$\alpha = \inf_{x>0} F(x) \quad \text{and} \quad c = \sup_{x>0} F(x).$$

We assume that there is a unique positive equilibrium $\bar{x}$ of (1.1) and

$$0 < \alpha < 1 = F(\bar{x}) < c < \infty. \quad (2.7)$$

The following theorem will give the uniform persistence of the population in model (1.1).

Theorem 2. *Assume that (2.1) – (2.3) and (2.7) hold. Then for every solution $\{A_n\}_{n=-m}^\infty$ of (1.1), we have*

$$\bar{x}\alpha^{m+1} < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n \leq \bar{x} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n < \bar{x}c^{m+1}.$$

Proof: As the above, let $\{P_n\}_{n=-\infty}^\infty$ and $\{Q_n\}_{n=-\infty}^\infty$ be full time solutions of (1.1) with $P_0 = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n$ and $Q_0 = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n$. We have

$$Q_0 = Q_{-1}F(Q_{-1-m}) \geq Q_0F(Q_{-1-m}),$$

so $1 \geq F(Q_{-1-m})$. Our assumptions assure that $F(x) \leq 1$ iff $x \geq \bar{x}$. Hence, $Q_{-1-m} \geq \bar{x}$, and consequently, $P_0 \geq \bar{x}$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0 &= Q_{-1}F(Q_{-1-m}) = Q_{-2}F(Q_{-2-m})F(Q_{-1-m}) = \dots \\ &= Q_{-1-m}F(Q_{-1-2m})F(Q_{-2m}) \dots F(Q_{-1-m}) > \alpha^{m+1}\bar{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$P_0 = P_{-1}F(P_{-1-m}) \leq P_0F(P_{-1-m}),$$

so $1 \leq F(P_{-1-m})$. But our assumptions imply that $F(x) \geq 1$ if and only if $x \leq \bar{x}$. Therefore, $P_{-1-m} \leq \bar{x}$. This implies that $Q_0 \leq \bar{x}$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= P_{-1}F(P_{-1-m}) = P_{-2}F(P_{-2-m})F(P_{-1-m}) = \dots \\ &= P_{-1-m}F(P_{-1-2m})F(P_{-2m}) \dots F(P_{-1-m}) < c^{m+1}\bar{x}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now complete.

3. 3/2-Stability

We assume further that

$$|\ln F(x)| \leq L |\ln(x/\bar{x})| \quad \text{for all } x \in (0, \bar{x}c^{m+1}). \quad (3.1)$$

Theorem 3. *Assume that (2.1) – (2.3), (2.7) and (3.1) hold. Suppose further that*

$$(m + \frac{3}{2})L < \frac{3}{2}.$$

Then every solution $\{A_n\}_{n=-m}^\infty$ of (1.1) converges to $\bar{x}$.

Proof: By Theorem 2, every nonoscillated solution converges to $\bar{x}$. Therefore, without loss of generality we assume that $L(m + \frac{3}{2}) \geq 1$ and $\{A_n\}_{n=-m}^\infty$ is an oscillated solution (if L is small we can enlarge it). This means that there is a sequence $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ of integers such that $A_{t_n} \leq \bar{x}$, $A_{t_n+1} > \bar{x}$ and $t_{n+1} - t_n > 3m$ for every $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Let

$$\rho_n > \left| \ln \frac{A_t}{\bar{x}} \right| \quad \text{for every } t \geq t_n - 2m.$$

Then

$$\left| \ln \frac{A_{t+1}}{A_t} \right| = |\ln F(A_{t-m})| \leq L \left| \ln \frac{A_{t-m}}{\bar{x}} \right| \leq L\rho_1$$

for all $t \geq t_1 - m$. Let $A_{t_*} \leq \bar{x}$, with $t_* \geq t_1$. It follows that

$$\left| \ln \frac{A_s}{\bar{x}} \right| \leq \sum_{t=s}^{t_*} \left| \ln \frac{A_{t+1}}{A_t} \right| \leq L\rho_1(t_* + 1 - s)$$

for all $s \in [t_1 - m, t_*]$. Furthermore,

$$\left| \ln \frac{A_{t+1}}{A_t} \right| = |\ln F(A_{t-m})| \leq L \left| \ln \frac{A_{t-m}}{\bar{x}} \right| \leq L^2\rho_1(t_* + m + 1 - t)$$

for all $t \in [t_1, t_* + m]$. First, we prove that

$$\left| \ln \frac{A_t}{\bar{x}} \right| \leq \rho_1 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad \text{for all } t > t_1 + m.$$

If this were not so, let

$$T = \min \left\{ t > t_1 + m : A_t > \bar{x} \quad \left| \ln \frac{A_t}{\bar{x}} \right| > \rho_1 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\}$$

If $A_{t_*} := A_{T-(m+1)} \leq \bar{x}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \rho_1 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right| &< \left| \ln \frac{A_T}{\bar{x}} \right| < \sum_{t=t_*}^{t_1+m} \left| \ln \frac{A_{t+1}}{A_t} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{t=t_*}^{t_*+m-\lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil} L\rho_1 + \sum_{t=t_*+m-\lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil+1}^{t_*+m} L^2\rho_1(t_* + m + 1 - t) \\ &\leq L\rho_1(m + 1 - \lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil) + \frac{1}{2}\rho_1 L^2 \lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil (\lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil + 1) \\ &\leq \rho_1 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction, so we have $A_{T-(m+1)} > \bar{x}$. Hence, $F(A_{T-(m+1)}) < 1$ and consequently, $A_{T-1} > A_T$. By the minimality of T , $T = t_1 + m + 1$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \rho_1 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right| &< \left| \ln \frac{A_T}{\bar{x}} \right| < \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_1+m} \left| \ln \frac{A_{t+1}}{A_t} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_1+m-\lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil} L\rho_1 + \sum_{t=t_1+m-\lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil+1}^{t_1+m} L^2\rho_1(t_1 + m + 1 - t) \\ &\leq L\rho_1(m + 1 - \lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil) + \frac{1}{2}\rho_1 L^2 \lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil (\lceil \frac{1}{L} \rceil + 1) \\ &\leq \rho_1 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction, so we have

$$\left| \ln \frac{A_t}{\bar{x}} \right| \leq \rho_1 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad \text{for all } t > t_1 + m.$$

This result ensures us to choose

$$\rho_2 = \rho_1 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

Repeat the above argument (with t_1 and ρ_1 replaced by t_2 and ρ_2) we have

$$\left| \ln \frac{A_t}{\bar{x}} \right| \leq \rho_2 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad \text{for all } t > t_2 + m.$$

By induction on n , we have

$$\left| \ln \frac{A_t}{\bar{x}} \right| \leq \rho_1 \left(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \right)^n \quad \text{for all } t > t_n + m.$$

Using the assumption $(L(m + \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{1}{2}) < 1$, we complete the proof.

4. Application

Now consider again the bobwhite quail population. Here,

$$F(x) = \alpha + \frac{\beta}{1 + x^r}.$$

We can compute

$$L = \frac{\beta r}{2\alpha + \beta + 2\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \alpha\beta}}.$$

Hence, if

$$m + \frac{3}{2} < \frac{2\alpha + \beta + 2\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \alpha\beta}}{\beta r} \cdot \frac{3}{2},$$

then $\bar{x}$ is globally attractive.

Next we consider the equation given by Pielou (1974)

$$A_{n+1} = \frac{\beta A_n}{1 + \lambda A_{n-m}}.$$

Here

$$F(x) = \frac{\beta}{1 + \lambda x},$$

and

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\beta - 1}{\lambda}.$$

We can compute

$$L = \frac{1}{\lambda \bar{x}} = \frac{1}{\beta - 1}.$$

Hence, if

$$m + \frac{3}{2} < \frac{3(\beta - 1)}{2},$$

then $\bar{x}$ is globally attractive.

References

- Giang, D.V., Huong, D.C., 2005. *Extinction, Persistence and Global stability in models of population growth*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **308**, pp 195-207.
- Graef, J.R. , Qian C., Spikes, P.W. ,1998. *Stability in a population model*, *Appl. Math. Comput.* **89**, pp 119-132.
- Graef, J.R. , Qian C., 2006. *Global attractivity in a nonlinear difference equation and application*, *Dynam. Systems Appl.* **15**, pp 89-96.
- Liz, E., 2007. *A sharp global stability result for a discrete population model*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **330**, pp 740-743.
- Liz, E., Tkachenko, V., Trofimchuk, S., 2006. *Global stability in discrete population models with delayed-sensity dependence*, *Math. Biosci.* **199**, pp 26-37.
- Pielou, E.C., 1974. "Population and Community Ecology", New York.
- Tkachenko, V., Trofimchuk, S., 2006. *A global attractivity criterion for non-linear non-au- tonomous difference equation*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **322**, pp 901-912.
- Walters, P., 1982. "An introduction to ergodic theory", Springer-Verlag.